

Feb. 20. 2007 5:04PM 9547233871

FEB 20 2007

No. 4981 P. 11

Application S/N 10/659,677
Amendment Dated: February 20, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: October 20, 2006

CE11928JAN

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0117324 to Iwai, et al. (Iwai) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0037739 to Boyle, et al. (Boyle). Further, claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18 and 20 were rejected in view of the Examiner taking Official Notice of alleged well-known prior art.

Independent claim 1 has been amended by clarifying that the antenna bandwidth enhancing slot directs existing electrical currents flowing in the metallized housing to take different paths to at least increase the bandwidth of the antenna. Independent claim 21 has been similarly amended. Moreover, independent claim 10 has been amended to clarify that the different paths have different lengths. Independent claim 16 and dependent claim 6 have been similarly amended. Support for the amendments can be found on page 4, lines 12-16. No new matter has been added in view of these amendments. Claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 18 and 20 recite the element of an "L-shaped" slot.

As the Examiner has noted, Iwai does not teach the concept of a bandwidth-increasing slot, as the slots in Iwai are actually radiating elements. Moreover, Iwai mentions nothing about the slots directing surface currents in different paths having different lengths to improve bandwidth. Boyle does describe the insertion of a slot in the ground plane of a handset to increase its resistance (see paragraphs 0038-0040). This slot, however, is vertical and is parallel to the length, or major axis, of the handset (see paragraph 0038). As such, any surface currents that would encounter such a configuration would take a uniform path, i.e., there would be no divergence of the

Application S/N 10/659,677
Amendment Dated: February 20, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: October 20, 2006

CE11928JAN

surface currents. Applicants also submit that Boyle teaches away from incorporating an L-shaped slot into its design, as Boyle expressly calls for a slot that is parallel to the major axis of the handset. An L-shaped slot cannot meet this requirement.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the above claims are now patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Application S/N 10/659,677
Amendment Dated: February 20, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: October 20, 2006

CE11928JAN

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit
any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871